DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 128 872 95 EA 008 467

TITLE	Facilities for Community Services. Educational Facilities Digest 10.
INSTITUTION	Council of Educational Facility Planners, Columbus, Ohio.; Oregon Univ., Eugene. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Oct 76
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-080353-3514
NOTE	9p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Council of Educational Facility Planners, International, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210 ($1.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Annotated Bibliographies; Community Schools; *Community Services; Facility Utilization Research; *Literature Reviews; *Shared Facilities; *Shared Services; Space Utilization

ABSTRACT

The trend toward community use of school space is influenced by the financial wisdom of extending the use of large, centrally located, and well-equipped, public buildings. When more services can share the same facility, taxpayer savings are greater and community access is easier. Different approaches that communities and educators have taken to share facilities, and their solutions to legal and administrative problems, are cited in references from the ERIC system. Twenty-five abstracts and four brief supplementary entries are contained in the digest. (Author/MLF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

FACILITIES FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES 10

OCTOBER 1976

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES DIGEST

PARTMENT OF HEALTH,
CATION & WELFARE
ONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

MENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
CTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
INTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
AL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
POSITION OR POLICY

pared by ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
olished by Council of Educational Facility Planners, International

FACILITIES FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

s of school facilities for community serv- from Saturday afternoon ball games on school's diamond to permanently estab- funded joint use of specially designed by both educational and noneducational While occasional use of a gymnasium for classroom for a meeting, or an audito- an invited speaker has been the rule in schools over the years, the regularly use of such facilities has been a recent nt.

st phase in this trend is the true com- hool in which space is not only designed use but is mutually managed by all the ng agencies. That this phase is very re- asily be seen by the recurring references, t the sources listed in this digest, to the schools: the John F. Kennedy School and Community Center in Atlanta; the Thomas Jefferson Junior High School and Community Center in Arlington, Virginia; and the Whitmer Human Resources Center in Pontiac, Michigan.

The trend toward community use of school space is both financial and social in its origin. The school is often the most centrally located, best-equipped, and largest public building in the community, and it is used for its primary purpose less than 40 hours a week. Using the building more fully not only provides greater dividends on the financial investment already made but eliminates the need to supply additional centrally located large spaces for public gatherings. Obviously, when more services can share the same facility, taxpayer savings are greater and community access is easier.

Facilities for community services are provided most frequently in three ways. The simplest is to

FACILITIES FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES EA 008 467

make currently used school space available for after-hours use. This raises the basic issues of staffing, supervision, scheduling, maintenance, security, access, rentals, and so forth, not to mention the adequacy of the facilities for extraeducational purposes.

A declining student population or an obsolescent building offers a second possibility: facilities no longer needed or usable for school purposes—whether single rooms, wings, floors, or whole buildings—can be renovated for use by the community. In some cases this means entirely releasing the school system from the burdens of administration, but it frequently means even more careful planning of joint administration.

The third major alternative is the construction of a new facility with cooperation from the beginning between the educational system and other community agencies. By the very nature of the commitment required, this last alternative is more likely to involve governmental bureaus dealing in health, recreation, welfare, counseling, and similar activities than to involve community social groups lacking substantial funding.

In addition to determining where community service facilities are to be located, it must be decided who is going to use them and how the space can best be fitted for the needs to be met. Providing a hot lunch program for the elderly may be an excellent idea, but placing the lunchroom up three flights of stairs may discourage attendance. External access to community locker rooms may improve use of a shared gymnasium.

Finally, there is the question of who makes the decisions. What is the makeup of the policy-determining body, and how is the community assured that its voice is heard? Who is responsible for what portion of the facility? Poor administration of a community center can negate years of careful planning and the most outstanding of floor plans and interlocked funding schemes.

While facilities for community services provide the physical space for educational, social, and cultural events, there is evidence to show that the benefits extend beyond the structure to enhance the lives of the clients. The planning processes that include citizens of all ages bring people together to increase their sense of contribution. The services to senior citizens, working parents, and preschool children contribute to emotional well being. The cultural activities attracted by community programs improve the quality of life and enhance the sense of aesthetics in a community.

Legal problems are possible when a public agency expands its role and opens its doors. Community discord can erupt over issues of building and land use, as well as over issues of governance. The construction of new facilities is an expensive matter for taxpayers to consider. But, where communities have gained citizen involvement and developed varied and exciting programs, the evidence suggests that the community service facility has often become the central focus of a way to improve community life.

Baillie, Susan J.; DeWitt, Laurence B.; and O'Leary, Linda Schluter. ***The Potential Role of the School As a Site for Integrating Social Services. A Report.*** **Syracuse, New York: Educational Policy Research Center, Syracuse Research Corporation, 1972. 148 pages. ED 081 088.**

To determine the feasibility of integrating educational and social service facilities, this report examines ten projects at various stages of development from planning to operation. The intent was not to provide a final answer but to identify problems, issues, and possible consequences of such programs.

The social benefits can be impressive; they include the lifting of neighborhood morale, racial desegregation, improved delivery of social services, and better attitudes toward education among adults. Success depends on significant community involvement, in itself considered a benefit.

Cost barriers are not great, and savings often result from combined facilities, though there is the potential for cost increases in some areas such as administration. Court decisions favoring community use of schools have eliminated the major legal barriers to introduction of noneducational programs into the schools.

The racial question remains to be answered. It is hard to determine whether the concept of the local school/community center is compatible with either busing in particular or neighborhood integration in general. Administrative and bureaucratic attitudes and regulations form yet another impediment, which the authors suggest might best be gotten around through the dedication of a person or body with "clout" and access to special funding.

Appendixes include case studies of the ten projects examined, state and federal regulations, articles on the roles of the community college and the university, inclusion of law enforcement among provided services, and the use of mobile units to deliver health and social services to school sites.

Order copies from EPRC Publications, Syracuse Research Corporation, Merrill Lane, University Heights, Syracuse, New York 13210. $2.00. Make checks payable to Syracuse Research Corporation.
Also available from EDRS. MF $0.83 HC $7.35. Specify ED number.

Bloom, Janet. "Street Scene School." *Architectural Forum*, 138, 5 (June 1973), pp. 38-45. EJ 080 410.

The $5,900,000 Human Resources Center in downtown Pontiac, Michigan, is a community school blending education and social services in response to the needs of people of all ages. Widely ranging programs from preschool and day care through university extension and adult classes occupy the building six days a week from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

Through use of text, diagrams, and photographs, Bloom describes the development of the Human Resources Center as a demonstration of how school districts can become catalysts in reversing the obsolescence, despair, and segregation of a typical inner city. The article presents a comprehensive and detailed explanation of the planning processes, social issues, architectural concepts and design, building use, and administration, as well as candid remarks about existing problems.

"By the People: Schools." *Progressive Architecture*, 53, 2 (February 1972), pp. 88-95. EJ 051 403.

A rented storefront with open door established community action as an integral part of the school design process in East Orange, New Jersey. Emphasizing photographs, floor-plan designs, student drawings, and sketches more than words, this article presents an innovative and sympathetic middle school resulting from community participation.

Three nearly independent educational family units called "houses" emphasize the learning ability and life pattern of each child in a building that educates 1,800 students. Shared facilities among the houses include homemaking, and the performing, industrial, and fine arts. Roof levels are designed as play areas and as a park for the community. The building in three units has identical upper levels with lofts, central areas for shared facilities, and at the lowest level a "street" with a variety of configuration and spatial events that connect the separate units. The gym, pool, library, auditorium, and medical services become joint-use facilities with the community.

The reader will discover that the planning process involving citizens and students contributes significantly more to the success of the school than the final physical design.

Clinchy, Evans. *Joint Occupancy: Profiles of Significant Schools.* New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1970. 37 pages. ED 046 079.

Sharing sites and sharing buildings are the basic requirements for joint occupancy, and the primary reason for sharing is financial. By leasing part of a site or building to private agencies, the school, the district, or the city can fund its educational construction in the remaining space at little or no cost to the taxpayer, while simultaneously preventing loss of tax income from the land to be used.

Joint occupancy with public agencies, while not providing additional revenue, saves money by avoiding duplications. The Whitmer Human Resources Center in Pontiac (Michigan), the Quincy School Complex in Boston, and the Drake/South Commons School in Chicago are all multiple-use facilities in which school space and community services have been combined effectively. Changes in state and federal laws were needed to permit some of the necessary public financing to make these centers possible, but with planning and work the changes were achieved.

Order copies from Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., 850 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022. $1.00.
Also available from EDRS. MF $0.83 HC $2.06. Specify ED number.

HOW TO ORDER ERIC REPORTS

Copies of journal articles (identified by EJ numbers) are not available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or from the Clearinghouse. Copies of ERIC documents (identified by ED numbers) may be ordered from EDRS in either microfiche (MF) or hard copy (HC). Do not order documents from this Clearinghouse unless so specified. When copies may be obtained from other sources, ordering information is given in the individual entry.

When ordering from EDRS, please include the ED numbers of documents requested. All orders must be in writing, and payment must accompany orders of less than $10.

Postage must be added to the cost of all orders. Rates are as follows. Microfiche: $0.25 for up to 60 fiche and $0.10 for each additional 60. Paper copy: $0.25 for first 60 pages and $0.10 for each additional 60. First class or air mail postage is available at additional cost.

Address requests to EDRS, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210.

Clinchy, Evans, and others. *Schools: More Space/Less Money. A Report.* New York, and Boston: Educational Facilities Laboratories, and Educational Planning Associates, 1971. 85 pages. ED 060 529.

There are many ways in which space can be obtained for school use more economically than by constructing conventional schools or additions. Found space in both school and nonschool buildings can be converted or renovated at reasonable cost. Present facilities can be more efficiently used through adaptation of extended day and extended year programs. Opening up the schools through such approaches as the open campus, the home-base school, the nonschool school, and the shared resource center also improves efficiency, giving the taxpayer more for the money.

Joint occupancy, especially by schools and other public agencies, can benefit all concerned. Efficiency and economy of operation, avoidance of duplication in services, supplies, and facilities, and maintenance of quality standards through combined funding can result from careful planning of the community school. Combining two or more facilities in one building can often make more space available to each, particularly when nonschool use is concentrated during nonschool hours. Examples of agencies that can team with schools are public libraries, day-care centers, health facilities, community colleges, job centers, welfare and social service agencies, and especially cultural and recreational centers.

.. The report concludes with two examples of major complexes that combine several of the above money- and space-saving approaches in integrated plans.

Order from EDRS. MF $0.83 HC $4.67. Specify ED number.

"Combined School/Public Library Reduces Cost by $500,000." *American School and University*, 47, 11 (July 1975), pp. 10-12. EJ 120 805.

By designing one building to house both a Pennsylvania elementary school and a public library, $500,000 was saved in initial building cost. By sharing spaces, personnel, fuel, and maintenance equipment and supplies, the two separate operations have continued to save money.

Careful planning has allowed several shared spaces, such as washrooms and maintenance areas, to act as buffer zones between the library and the school, reducing noise problems. In addition, the concentration of library use at non-school hours has permitted several spaces to serve different functions during the school day and after it. The proximity of library and school allows one children's librarian to serve both. Borrowing at the new library has increased 88 percent, though it is not clear whether this figure is specifically related to the coordination of the two facilities.

A plan of the building's first floor clarifies the way in which the space fills several functions.

"Community Schools Share the Space and the Action." *Nation's Schools*, 93, 3 (March 1974), pp. 29-32, 35. EJ 092 691.

John F. Kennedy School and Community Center (Atlanta, Georgia), the Thomas Jefferson Junior High School and Community Center (Arlington, Virginia), and the Whitmer Human Resources Center (Pontiac, Michigan) are three buildings with integrated school and community programs. These schools have in common a building designed to meet joint specifications of school and community representatives and operated as a partnership. They also feature shared facilities between community and school, a joint financing plan, and a centralized administration.

This article, excerpted from an Educational Facilities Laboratories publication, *Community/School*, describes the design of the facilities and briefly presents the educational programs and community activities. John F. Kennedy is called a shopping center of social services. Thomas Jefferson is busy 18 hours a day, seven days a week. Whitmer Human Resources Center is the hub of small-town renewal. Each of the centers serves different populations and provides a variety of services ranging from elementary school to university extension classes, from arts to sports, and from kindergarten to senior citizen.

Conrad, Arthur T. "Wider Use of Schools." *Education Canada*, 13, 4 (December 1973), pp. 4-8. EJ 092 145.

School facilities can and should be made available to the community, but administrative planning is necessary to prevent problems before they occur. Guidelines must be established so that all users of the space, whether educators or community members, are aware of where authority lies and where to turn for answers to the questions that come up.

Decisions have to be made in advance regarding how much of the cost of maintaining the facility is to be passed on to the community users (custodial, utility, space usage, and even possible breakage costs must be considered) and how much absorbed by the school system; what regulations apply regarding smoking, use of staff rooms, and so forth; what security measures must be taken; what storage facilities can be made available; and how the school staff is to be

East Orange Middle School, East Orange, New Jersey. Photo courtesy of UNIPLAN, Inc.

assured that the school they regard as theirs is being adequately protected.

"Designs for the Urban Educational Facility: Problems and Solutions." *CEFP Journal*, 12, 2 (March/April 1974), pp. 7-9. EJ 096 033.

This edited version of the report of the Subcommittee on Urban Education of the AIA Committee on Architecture for Education states that with increased community-school interaction urban school districts are achieving solutions to socioeconomic problems confronting the entire community. Urban economic constraints encourage minimizing land area requirements and combining various community services with schools into single facilities. Several existing solutions are cited.

Responding to socioeconomic problems, the report concludes that schools need not be central to community services, but must be designed to be part of an integrated network sharing the efforts toward an urban rebirth.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. *Schoolhouse. A Newsletter from Educational Facilities Laboratories, No. 21, September 1975.* New York: 1975. 9 pages. ED 112 458.

One school district, in Arlington, Virginia, has had "extensive experience in the use of school space for community purposes." Several methods have been applied, including acquisition of an entire abandoned school by a community agency; "dedication" of space (a technique that grants space to a group on a fairly permanent basis) in a school with a shrinking student body; the building of a specially designed addition allowing maximum community access to a school's existing gymnasium, kitchen, cafeteria, auditorium, and stage; and the construction of a cooperatively planned and designed full-fledged community school, Thomas Jefferson Junior High School, which has become a model throughout the literature.

The programs and facilities provided, and the kinds of groups providing them, are surprisingly numerous. The potential clientele excludes no one, from the unborn infant to the oldest citizen. Assistant Superintendent Ringers notes that "the key in all cases is to gain or maintain community values."

Order from EDRS. MF $0.83 HC $1.67. Specify ED number.

Gores, Harold B. "Community Education: Schoolhouse of the Future." *Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation*, 45, 4 (April 1974), pp. 53-54. EJ 095 500.

Whereas school buildings have been fixed, settled, and predictable buildings, the future promises changes. There are options in school and community service combinations that create new designs and uses for school buildings. Gores notes several observable trends, which include a change in name from schoolhouse to "center," the enlargement of services to include health, recreation, cultural, and civic functions, and changes in the style and use of gymnasiums.

He predicts that school buildings will become places for all people of all ages, built by modular construction, and serving as the center of a "solar system" of education and civic activities. He concludes that schoolhouses will move to center stage as the principal instrument for shaping the renewal of our human habitation.

Green, Alan C. "Look Who's under the Same Roof Now." *AIA Journal*, 60, 4 (October 1973), pp. 26-31. EJ 087 675.

Emerging physical arrangements may reduce the compartmentalization current among political, social, and educational institutions. Using excess school and college space for community purposes, building extra space to provide room for other services, providing educational and social services through cooperative building ventures, joining schools and housing or commercial enterprise, joining with educational partners, and planning for students and the community are ways suggested to place institutional programs under one roof.

Informative graphics in this article illustrate some existing facilities that incorporate the concepts discussed.

TITLES IN THIS SERIES

1. Enrollment Forecasting
2. Evaluating the Existing School Plant
3. Computerized Planning Methods
4. Fiscal Planning for School Construction
5. Life-Cycle Costing
6. Educational Specifications
7. Community Participation in Planning
8. Techniques for Closing Schools
9. Energy Conservation
10. Facilities for Community Services
11. Alternative Uses of School Buildings
12. Building Renovation and Modernization
13. Facilities for the Handicapped

Hammond, Doris L. "Profile: Steuart Hill School." *National Elementary Principal*, 52, 1 (September 1972), pp. 37-38. EJ 065 687.

Completed in 1969, the Steuart Hill School in Baltimore is a fully carpeted, air-conditioned, open plan, nongraded, team-teaching school serving 850 students, ages 2 to 12. The design blends architecturally with the neighborhood and provides a recreational and cultural center for the community. The building is designed for exclusive community use at the lower level and exclusive school use at the top level with shared facilities in between.

This community-oriented school combines with other agencies to provide support programs such as psychological and medical services. An advisory committee for community and school staff members assists the administration.

Hughes, Frances W. "Washington, D.C. Builds First of Seven Community Resource Centers." *Community Education Journal*, 4, 5 (September/October 1974), pp. 20-23. EJ 102 614.

The first of several community facility schools in Washington, D.C. is an interagency venture described by Hughes as a "one-stop shopping center for human services." Combining an open space elementary school, a center for health and physical fitness, and a center for social and welfare services, the building contains 171,200 square feet of space with 90,500 square feet devoted to community use and/or shared space. The complex comprises four centers that can operate independently. During full operation it will offer programs 14 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year providing service for community people from the cradle through retirement.

Grass-roots-level citizen involvement that guided the development of the Washington Highland Community School is described with references to community and educational problems that were encountered. The article concludes with physical and conceptual descriptions of the facility's four centers in operation.

Kaplan, Michael. "The Junior High: An Expanded Community School." *Community Education Journal*, 3, 3 (May 1973), pp. 20, 30. EJ 078 623.

The typical junior high school facility offers advantages to the community that many elementary schools cannot provide. Gymnasiums, swimming pools, home economics equipment, industrial arts equipment, and fine arts facilities typically found in junior high buildings can be beneficially shared with the co.....unity service program.

The junior high school can offer expansion of community services by attracting various neighborhood groups together from the feeder elementary schools. The expertise in the community service program can contribute to the day program of the junior high school.

Kaplan, Samuel. "Profile: Chinatown Plaza." *National Elementary Principal*, 52, 1 (September 1972), pp. 34-36. EJ 065 686.

Chinatown Plaza in New York City is an example of new multiuse structures that integrate public and private facilities whose design meets increasing common concerns for new schools, housing, and services. This 104,000-square-foot school houses 1,200 students, forms the cornerstone to a 44-story apartment complex, and integrates education and various community services. Kaplan concludes that the goal is not only to build better schools but to build better communities.

Kirby, John T. "Community Use of School Facilities." *Community Education Journal*, 1, 2 (May 1971), pp. 14-15, 59. EJ 037 957.

Court challenges to use of school facilities for community services have been successfully defended under the statutory discretion granted to school boards and under the statutes defining school purposes broadly. However, a historical objection to use of school facilities for community purposes can logically be based on statutes that limit the power and duties of school boards only to those defined in statutes and on the rationale that tax money may be used only for the purposes for which it was levied.

Legal opinion has advanced to the place where fewer questions with respect to the legality of community use of school facilities are b .ng raised; however, school officials are advised to be prepared with logical and legal arguments to face challenges that may arise.

Loewenberg, Frank M. "Utilization of Schools for Community Centers in Israel." *Community Development Journal*, 10, 2 (April 1975), pp. 126-131. EJ 117 058.

Rising social problems in Israel, accentuated by widespread immigration from over 70 countries, has made a social program a necessity. A government decision to establish community centers in every town has been hampered by demands on manpower, time, and money. Use of schools for community purposes has never previously been attempted in Israel but now appears to be a solution to the dilemma.

This article reports on a pilot program comparing combined school-community centers with autonomous community centers in terms of types of activities proposed and used and the effectiveness of the different approaches. The study revealed no consistent differences in target problems and found similar types of activities in use to address them.

The furniture available in schools, educational demands on materials, and restrictions placed on building use by principals had some impact on community activities offered. Use of school facilities also created organizational problems that took community center staff away from their primary responsibilities. Control of the school facility by educators and local government, as opposed to the total autonomy of specially built centers, resulted in the crippling of school-based community center boards and a consequent lowering of interest and morale.

Mogan, Patrick J. "Profile: Lowell's Everywhere School." *National Elementary Principal*, 52, 1 (September 1972), pp. 31-33. EJ 065 685.

In the face of economic, social, and physical decline, Lowell, Massachusetts, plans a broad program of urban renewal that includes a Center for Human Development. The center will feature day-care centers, bilingual education, remedial services, social work, tutorial programs, and adult education. Called the Everywhere School, Lowell envisions an educative city using existing facilities and community and natural resources. The neighborhood and the city will become an integral element of education to ultimately complete the center, a coordinated human service delivery system, and an urban cultural park.

Moir, D. A. *The Educational Specifications for Educational Facilities in the Britannia Community Services Centre.* Vancouver, British Columbia: Department of Planning and Evaluation, Vancouver Board of School Trustees, 1972. 35 pages. ED 077 091.

The Vancouver Board of School Trustees holds a commitment to community involvement in school affairs, to community use of school facilities, and to cooperation with other agencies to develop community services and facilities. Their philosophy is contained in the Halsy report of 1967,

John F. Kennedy School and Community Center. Photo courtesy of Atlanta (Georgia) Public Schools.

which proposed that community centers be built in neighborhoods through cooperative effort embracing the concepts of joint use of space, joint use of facilities and equipment, joint use of personnel, and cost sharing.

This report presents detailed educational specifications for the construction of an elementary school, an addition to a secondary school, and a Library Resources Centre jointly sponsored by the school board and the public library board with community activities part of the planned use. The roles of other agencies are specified to reveal a complete community services center.

Order from EDRS. MF $0.83 HC $2.06. Specify ED number.

Molloy, Larry. *Community/School: Sharing the Space and the Action. A Report.* New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1973. 98 pages. ED 084 643.

Whereas some community schools open their doors to the public after students leave, other community schools do not distinguish between school hours and community hours. This publication presents the "community/schools" concept that the entire building is operated for the benefit of people of all ages in the community.

Focusing centrally on the John F. Kennedy Center in Atlanta, the Thomas Jefferson Center in Arlington, and the Whitmer Center in Pontiac, with additional illustrations drawn from a wide range of programs across the United States and Canada, this report discusses the major aspects of community school programs. Topics covered include legal complications involving restrictions on sharing space, obtaining funding, and integrating the full community; sources of funding from the federal government to private industry, and techniques for budgeting operational expenses; the elements of planning, notably resources, participants, the community, and innovative methods for fostering active involvement in the process; designs applied to maximize the benefits of space sharing; and administrative structures and their emphases.

Numerous tables and figures support the information provided, though some of the diagrams improve the design of the publication more than they explain the design of the community schools or processes they supposedly illustrate. Reference to diagrams accompanying other documents cited in this listing can clarify some of the ambiguities.

Order copies from Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., 850 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022. $4.00.
Also available from EDRS. MF $0.83 HC $4.67. Specify ED number.

"The More Use a Surrounding Community Can Make of Its School Building, the More Interest It Will Have in the School." *School Management,* 18, 4 (April 1974), pp. 36-37. EJ 094 624.

The Kinsella Community School, Hartford, Connecticut, houses 1,000 prekindergarten through grade six students and a day-care facility. It also serves as a recreation center for community groups. The architect's planning, citizen involvement, physical facilities, and educational programs are discussed in this short article.

Passantino, Richard J. "Community/School Facilities: The Schoolhouse of the Future." *Phi Delta Kappan,* 56, 5 (January 1975), pp. 306-309. EJ 109 237.

Until comparatively recently, education was carried out within the community-at-large rather than in the specialized and isolated environments we now call schools. In discussing the development of the community school idea over the

last 40 years, Passantino stresses the increased planning necessary to make increased cooperation between community and school most beneficial to all.

Community schools have developed in three generations. The first was the "lighted school," the second involved mutual management of recreational facilities, and the current generation has added medical and social services to those previously provided. More thorough development of the urban planning elements, including housing, transportation, and commercial space may be the next step in the growth of the concept.

Facilities for community services, in this view, are not limited to spaces provided by the schools. To the contrary, education becomes simply one service element in a complex that must be planned by and for the entire community.

Ringers, Joe, Jr. "Community Schools. Major Issues for '75." *CEFP Journal*, 12, 4 (July/August 1974), pp. 8-9. EJ 102 572.

With careful planning and slight additional cost, a school can also be a community facility that delivers essential services to a broad range of citizens. The success of community services depends on top-level administrative commitment, clearly written goals and objectives, effective two-way communications for problem-solving, a positive attitude toward providing services, and periodic reassessment.

When space is jointly occupied by school and community activities there are social and economic advantages, suggesting that the four-wall concept of education is outmoded and that a working partnership must be developed with other agencies engaged in the creative development of human resources.

"Tunnels Used in Community School Plan." *School Management*, 16, 2 (February 1972), pp. 21, 34. EJ 051 788.

The Brightwood Community School in Springfield, Massachusetts, built on a 17-acre site divided into three sections by railroad tracks and a major highway, will utilize tunnels to house community facilities on otherwise unusable land. The $14 million project will house students in grades four through six and serve as a cultural, recreational, and social center for the neighborhood and its broader community.

The tunnel design incorporates a pedestrian mall that connects the facilities and gives the immediate neighborhood access to the facilities. The total project assigns 38 percent of the area to exclusive school use, 45 percent to shared school and community use, and 17 percent to exclusive community use.

It is suggested that these unique plans have opened dialogue with all segments of the Springfield community that may benefit further urban renewal.

SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baas, Alan M. *Joint Occupancy. Educational Facilities Review Series Number 22.* Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1973. 6 pages. ED 083 666 MF $0.83 HC $1.67. (Also available from ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403. Free.) Provides a brief analysis of joint occupancy as treated in 13 references from the ERIC system.

Corman, Linda, compiler. *Community Education in Canada. An Annotated Bibliography. OISE Bibliography Series No. 2.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1975. 55 pages. ED 114 949. Document not available from EDRS. (Available from Publications Sales, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario, M5S 1V6, Canada. $2.25.) Contains sources that may be difficult to locate in the United States but could prove quite useful. Many reports on governmental programs are included.

Higham, Charlene Ellison. *Joint Occupancy.* [1975]. 25 pages. ED 109 800 MF $0.83 HC not available from EDRS. An annotated listing of 15 articles and reports includes an introduction to the concept of joint occupancy.

Thornton, James E., and Gubbels, Joseph, compilers. *The Community School: A Working Bibliography. Research Paper No. 1.* Burnaby, British Columbia: Pacific Association for Continuing Education, n.d. 23 pages. ED 109 465 MF $0.83 HC $1.67. Includes references from as early as 1902 to give a comprehensive view of the development of the community school concept through the century.

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the National Institute of Education. ERIC serves educators by disseminating research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of several such units in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its companion units process research reports and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins. Research reports are announced in *Resources in Education (RIE)*, available in many libraries and by subscription for $42.70 a year from the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Journal articles are announced in *Current Index to Journals in Education. CIJE* is also available in many libraries and can be ordered for $50 a year from Macmillan Information, 216R Brown Street, Riverside, New Jersey 08075. Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, monographs, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its educational area.

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Council of Educational Facility Planners, International, for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Council of Educational Facility Planners, International, or the National Institute of Education.

EA 008 467

prepared by
ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

published by
Council of Educational Facility Planners, International
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210